UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,272	09/25/2006	Petrus Johannes Lenoir	NL 040315	6405
	7590 02/23/201 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		KING, JOHN B		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2435		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/599,272	LENOIR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	John B. King	2435	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appea for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods: 	ne same day as filing a Notice plies: (1) an amendment, affic al (with appeal fee) in complial	e of Appeal. To avoid abar davit, or other evidence, w nce with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advance event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). 	visory Action, or (2) the date set fer than SIX MONTHS from the m). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN	ailing date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date or have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exterunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the ship set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nsion and the corresponding amo ortened statutory period for reply	ount of the fee. The appropria originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complia filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but (a) They raise new issues that would require further cons (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see); er form for appeal by materially	NOTE below); y reducing or simplifying th	
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1164. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1215. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	6 and 41.33(a)). I. See attached Notice of Non	•	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).		ate, timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 33-60. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		will be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but I because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and s was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ove showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary a	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under a <mark>r</mark>	ppeal and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but one of the considered of the c		•	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (P 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	_	
/Kimyen Vu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435	/John B King/ Examiner, Art Unit 2	435	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: No Allowable Subject Matter was indicated in the Final Office Action and this case would require further consideration if entered.

Continuation of 13. Other: The previous 35 USC 101 and 112 rejections still stand. Claims 47-59 recite "means for" language which is modified by sufficient structure to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the desired limitation. For example, in claim 47, the second "means for binding" is followed by enough structure to allow the limitation be performed. Specific details are included regarding the Device Owner List and the identifiers to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to perform this limitation. Also, the claimed "computer readable storage medium" of claim 60 should recite a "non-transitory computer readable storage medium" under current USPTO guidelines to overcome the rejections to claim 60.

Applicant's claims 33, 47, and 60 recite generating a domain list by binding devices to users and storing this in a list labeling the devices, users, and domain with identifiers. Nakahara, paragraphs 200-206, teaches having a user generating a domain list which contains function ids of content usage devices units i.e. the user is bound to those specific content usage devices by the function ids. When a license management unit does not belong to the domain (i.e. does not belong to the user) it is not granted access. Therefore, the examiner feels that the cited prior art covers the presented claim limitations.